

Using ARL Salary Data to Establish and Maintain an Equitable Salary Structure for Faculty Librarians



Webcast

Association of Research Libraries

September 10, 2013

Thank You for Joining Us



-
- Everyone will be muted to cut down on background noise.
 - Please type your questions in the chat box.
 - A recording of the webcast will be posted on ARL's YouTube channel. In addition, slides and supporting documents will be available in the University of Florida institutional repository.

ARL Salary Survey



-
- The ARL Annual Salary Survey reports salaries for more than 12,000 professional positions in ARL member libraries on an annual basis.
 - The survey also tracks minority representation in US ARL libraries and reports separate data for health sciences and law libraries.
-

Introductions



-
- **Martha Kyrillidou**, Senior Director, ARL Statistics and Service Quality Programs, Association of Research Libraries
 - **Judy Ruttenberg**, Program Director for Transforming Research Libraries, Association of Research Libraries
 - **Brian W. Keith**, Associate Dean for Human and Financial Resources, University of Florida Libraries

Agenda



-
- Overview of the ARL's Transforming Research Libraries program
 - Discussion of how the University of Florida Libraries used data from the ARL Salary Survey to implement an internally and externally equitable salary structure for faculty librarians.
-



Judy Ruttenberg

Program Director
Transforming Research
Libraries (TRL)
Association of Research
Libraries

TRL Priorities



-
- Strategic focus on the transforming workforce
 - New services, new competencies, new skills
 - Develop existing staff and recruit new talent
 - Tools for the transforming organization
 - Compensation management: fairness, equity, transparency



Brian W. Keith

Associate Dean,
Administrative Services
and Faculty Affairs,
University of Florida
Libraries



Note: Slides with links, documents and spreadsheets with calculations are available at

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu/l/AA00016874/>



Note: All webcasts in this series can be found on ARL's YouTube channel:

<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLaHPiIKtRXCLb39HB41JzS25PUvLiUys>

Prologue



The objectives of compensation programs include:

- *Recruitment*
- *Retention*
- *Equity*
- *Reward desired behavior*
- *Control costs*
- *Comply with legal regulations*
- *Further administrative efficiency*

This session



1. Key Concepts

- Equity/Fairness
 - Salary Plan Design (Elements and Terminology)
-

This session



2. Experiences at the UF Libraries

- Decisions and policies establishing and maintaining librarian salary structures, referenced to the ARL Salary Survey data

This session



2. Experiences at the UF Libraries

Why?

- Illustrate the above concepts in practice
 - Depict decisions, processes and outcomes
 - Resulting system is transparent and maintainable,
and
modular and customizable --transferable
-

This session



3. References



Concepts

Equity and Fairness



Equity

- External
- Internal
- Individual
- Personal

Fairness

- Distributive
- Procedural

Forms of Equity



- External

In comparison to similar jobs in other organizations

- Internal

In comparison of different types of jobs in one organization

Forms of Equity



- **Individual**

In comparison of performance of individuals working in the same type of job in the same organization

- **Personal**

Comparison to the employee's perception of his or her worth

Fairness Types



- Distributive

Perceived equity of the pay received by employees

- Procedural

Perceived equity of the decision-making processes and procedures used to distribute pay

Fairness and Equity



Research has generally found Procedural Fairness is most important for employee pay satisfaction.

Individual Equity is the second most important.

Fairness Types



-
- Procedural Fairness (continued)
 - Strongly influences whether employees view the organization and management as trustworthy and valuing them.

Fairness Types



-
- Procedural Fairness (continued)
 - Increased through:
 - Consistency
 - Design participation
 - Good communication practices
 - Redress opportunities



Salary Administration

Salary Administration



Three fundamental issues for pay policies:

- (1) setting pay levels in relation to other companies
- (2) evaluating individual jobs and determining pay relationships among them; and
- (3) determining pay relationships among individual workers within the same job.

Salary Administration



These issues are addressed through effective
Salary Structures

What is a Salary Structure?



System where jobs of roughly equal value or worth are grouped into grades with competitive salary ranges.

Note:

One employer may have multiple models or approaches within this structure.

Why establish a structure?



Compensation decisions made solely to pacify employees inevitably produce higher operating costs and create an environment that rewards complaints rather than performance.

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Why establish a structure?



Individualized compensation arrangements rarely go unnoticed by other employees, despite the company's best efforts at secrecy, and usually cause some rancor within the employee group.

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Why establish a structure?



By establishing compensation guidelines based on current market norms before recruiting for a position, employers can balance:

“How much must we pay for this desirable candidate?”

and

“How much should we pay to staff this position?”

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Why establish a structure?



Even though they may be responsible for managing costs, most managers strive to provide their employees with the highest possible compensation because they don't suffer directly from the increased cost and they benefit from being the "nice guys".

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Why establish a structure?



When individual managers make decisions regarding subordinate compensation, every unit is likely to receive dissimilar pay for similar tasks.

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Why establish a structure?



Provides:

- Organizational consistency
- Reference for career development and predicting pay increases

Both of which serve the objectives from the Prologue.

Whittlesey,
Maurer

How do you develop a Salary Structure?



Through

- Compensable Factors

and

- Pay Ranges

Compensable Factors



Definition:

Any job attribute that provides a basis for determining the worth of the job.

Compensable Factors



Employee-based examples :

- Education/training
- Experience
- Certification/licenses
- Unique SKA's

Compensable Factors



Job-based examples :

- Customer relations/service
- Communications/ key interactions/ level of contact
- Supervisory responsibility
- Supervision received
- Job Complexity
- Problem solving
- Decision making (authority and impact)
- Working conditions
- Responsibility for assets

Compensable Factors



Their use requires decisions regarding:

- weights
- degrees or levels

Pay Range



Definition:

The minimum to the maximum base rate of pay for employees in the same or similar job

- Often expressed pay grades

Range Width



Definition:

Percentage difference from the minimum to the maximum of a pay range

- Vary, but typically narrower for lower pay grades
- Rate minimums should attract qualified job candidates while rate maximums should be set to reward and retain high achievers

Range Progression



Definition:

The difference, or jump, from one grade to the next

- Vary by position type, but typically smaller for lower pay grades.
- Should be large enough to reflect progressive increases in compensable elements of the positions grouped together.

Range Midpoint



Used to orient salary levels

- for example, the more highly rated or the most experienced employees are above the midpoint

Generally, for white-collar workers, the midpoint represents a job's market value.

Salary Structural Integrity



An organization that has invested time and effort in designing an equitable, competitive program must be willing to adhere to it, or there really is no program at all.

Whittlesey,
Maurer

Salary Structural Integrity



Maintained through policies for

- Recruiting
 - Counter Offers
 - Promotions
 - Lateral Moves
 - Merit and ATB Increases
-



 Concepts

And now UF...

UF Orientation



Main Campus and Medical Libraries Employee Population

Faculty	84
Staff	169
Students and OPS	164
Total	417

UF Orientation



Library Faculty

9 month	3
Adjunct/Visiting	2
12 Month	79
Total	84

UF Orientation



3 Levels of Library Faculty Ranks

Assistant IN	2
Assistant UL	23
Associate IN	3
Associate UL	38
Senior Associate IN	0
UL	15

UF Libraries Salary Systems



Library Staff

“Library types” (1)

Others

IT (2)

Non-IT (3)

Library Faculty

Deans (4)

Chairs and Associate Chairs (5)

All others (6)

Students and OPS (7)

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Historic Issues with UF Librarian Salaries

- Compression
 - Ad hoc salary decisions based (inconsistently) upon
 - rank
 - assumptions of job worth and market demand
 - Lack of transparency
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee formed in 2008

Charge:

Establish a market equity design with an internally and externally equitable salary structure

Final report submitted March 2009

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- Association of Research Libraries (ARL) [Salary Survey](#) is a serviceable external measure

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- ARL US, public university libraries constitute a suitable representation of UF's peer institutions

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- ARL’s “non-administrative” job types are the most reasonable basis for external linkage

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- Applying locally defined compensable factors allows for internal equity
 - Advanced degrees held in addition to the MLS, which are applicable to the job assignment
 - A limited number of librarian positions require uncommon skills, such as foreign language fluency

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- Salaries should reflect differences in librarian rank and length of service
 - 12-15 years of service represented the midpoint of the distribution for ARL data and, with the UF rank of Associate UL, represented UF's population midpoint

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Joint Committee Findings:

- Performance is an important component of an equitable salary structure ...

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Establishing a NEW Librarian Salary Structure

- Next turn at bat: Library Administration

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

- Comprehensive
- Broad participation among ARL HR officers, including UF
- Provides comparison data for UF's peer institutions

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

- Large data pool offers higher validity
- Includes position specific data
 - can assume HR Officers would *likely* interpret definitions similarly

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

- Updated annually

- Easy to rework figures based on current year's data

- Joint committee used 08-09

- Implementation based on 09-10

- Includes data from law and medical libraries

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

– Plus, the data is accessible

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

All of these factors make this the ‘go to’ salary reference for ARL institutions

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

- Challenges

- Tables are numerous but statistics and tables are limited for our purposes
 - This requires the deriving of data

<http://publications.arl.org/ARL-Annual-Salary-Survey-2009%E2%80%932010/>



ARL Salary Survey – My Take

- Challenges

- Definitions of job “codes”
 - **Subject Specialist** - primarily build collections, but may also offer specialized reference and bibliographic services
 - **Reference librarians**, both general and specialized
 - **Public Services**, non-supervisory, except reference librarians

<http://publications.arl.org/ARL-Annual-Salary-Survey-2009%E2%80%932010/>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Reminder: ALL calculations used in UF Library Faculty Market Equity are reflected in the spreadsheet posted at

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu/l/AA00016874/>

Note: There you can also find a primer on weighted averages

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey – Tables of Interest

Table 25: average salaries by position and geographic region

Table 26: average salaries of US librarians by position and years of experience

Figure 5: average salaries for Functional Specialists

Table 20: average salaries by position and years of experience

<http://publications.arl.org/ARL-Annual-Salary-Survey-2009%E2%80%932010/>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Comparison of Regions

Note:

Derived from Table 25

Required establishment of 'core librarian' positions

See: “Calc of Regional Factor”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Calculation of average salaries for subject specialist, reference, and public services; and catalogers and technical services

Note: Derived from Table 26

See: “WAVG for TS, Cat., & SS-Ref-PS”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu/l/AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Average salaries for functional specialist provided in Figure 5

See: “AVG for FUNCTSPEC”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



ARL Salary Survey - Analysis

Establish years of experience and job type midpoints

Note: Derived from Table 26

See: “Calc of Exp Factors”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Findings

1. Variations exist between, regions and type of entity (public v. private)
 2. Years of experience is a stable predictor of salary
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Findings

3. Medical positions would be addressed with ARL numbers (versus MLA)

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Findings

4. Average salaries vary significantly by job type

See: “Combined Midpoints”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions necessary to create a Library
Faculty Salary Structure

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions: Relevant Market

- We would use South Atlantic, Public and Private
 - Applying a factor of .9383 to national averages

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions:

- We would determine a “base salary” specific to each faculty member based upon
 - Position-specific factors
(e.g. “job type”)
 - Individual-specific factors
(e.g. experience)
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions: Position Groupings

- We would merge Subject Specialist, Reference, and Public Services “job types”

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions:

- Stipends for department chairs and associate chairs excluded from the base salary calculations

See: [Stipend for Smathers Libraries](#)

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions:

- Salary specific to each faculty member based upon
 1. Position-specific factors
 - Job Type
 - Language: Adjust up 9%, if foreign language required for position

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions:

- Salary specific to each faculty member based upon
 2. Individual-specific compensable factors:
 - Rank: Adjust up or down, from Associate, by 9% for Assistant UL and UL
 - Length of Service: Adjust up or down for applicable experience above or below ARL average

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



See: Resulting Faculty Salary Structure

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00003>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Implications:

- Faculty in similar job types form peer groups (position groupings)
 - Other factors will differentiate their actual salaries (compensable factors)
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions:

- Salary specific to each faculty member based upon
 2. Individual-specific compensable factors
(continued):
 - Advanced Degrees: Adjust up for additional relevant advanced degrees (maximum of \$5,000)
 - Performance: Adjust up to retain effect of 2010 merit increases

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Decisions regarding Performance and Eligibility:

- Cap all raises at 18%
- Cap raises at 9% for faculty with “Achieves” (or no evaluation) in primary responsibility in either of the past 2 years
- Exclude faculty with “Does Not Meet” in any category in either of the past 2 years

Does not preclude the ability to apply for individual market equity evaluations

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Application

See: “Examples of Salary Calculation”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00002>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Communication

See: corresponding “Library Faculty Market Equity Assessment Report”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00004>

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



To summarize:

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



-
1. External equity based on:
 - Job type (Midpoint for ranges)
 - Geographic region (Application of ATB Factor)
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



2. Internal equity based on:

- Years of experience (with UF Ranks imposed)
 - Special requirements of the position
 - SKA (Language)
 - Administrative (Stipends)
 - Educational credentials
 - Performance (inclusion of past merit & qualifiers)
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Results

Total eligible: 76 Library Faculty

- 49 (64%) targeted to receive raise
 - 19 (25%) already at or above market equity
 - 8 (11%) do not meet minimum requirement
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Results

- Of the 49 targeted to receive raise
 - 7 faculty capped at 18%
 - 7 faculty capped at 9%
-

Salary Systems – Library Faculty



Maintenance:

See: “Librarian Search Offer”

<http://ufdc.ufl.edu//AA00016874/00005>

References



Terpstra, D., & Honoree, A. (2003, November). The Relative Importance of External, Internal, Individual and Procedural Equity to Pay Satisfaction: Procedural Equity May be More Important to Employees Than Organizations Believe, *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 35 (6), 67-74.

Singer, P. M., & Francisco, L. L. (2009). *Developing a compensation plan for your library*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Romanoff, K., Boehm, K., & Benson, E. (1986, December). Pay Equity: Internal and External Considerations. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 18 (6), 17-25.

Bloom, M. (2004). The Ethics of Compensation Systems. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 52 (2), 149-152

Duda, F. (1989, Summer) Developing Compensation Systems in Academic Libraries. *Library Trends*, 38 (1), 103-126

Personick, M. (1984, December). White-Collar Pay Determination under Range-of-Rate Systems, *Monthly Labor Review*, 107, (12), 25-30

Whittlesey, Z., & Maurer, C. (1993, July). Ten common compensation mistakes, *Compensation and Benefits Review*, 25 (4), 44-48.

Sunday, K., & Pfuntner, J. (2008). How widely do wages vary within jobs in the same establishment? *Monthly Labor Review*, 131(2), 17-50.

Effectively Using ARL Salary and Demographic Data



-
- **March 5:** Better Salaries with Better Data: Introduction to the ARL Salary Survey
 - **May 21:** Using ARL Salary Data to Make the Case for Higher Salaries
 - **September 10:** Case Study: Using ARL Salary Data to Establish and Maintain an Equitable Salary Structure for Faculty Librarians
 - **November 5:** Analyzing Age and Race/Ethnicity Demographics
-



THANK YOU
